

Appl. No.: 10/560,560

Reply to Office Action of: 03/31/2008

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2-3, 7-10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bright et al. (US 6,752,663 B2) in view of Capp et al. (US 5,752,854). Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bright et al. (US 6,752,663 B2) in view of Capp et al. (US 5,752,854) and Carey, II et al. (US 6,858,322 B2). Claims 1-3, 5-10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang (US 6,478,622 B1) in view of Goodman et al. (US 5,037,331). Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang (US 6,478,622 B1) in view of Goodman et al. (US 5,037,331) and Carey, II et al. (US 6,858,322 B2). Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-10 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (US 6,926,557 B1) in view of Goodman et al. (US 5,037,331). Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (US 6,926,557 B1) in view of Goodman et al. (US 5,037,331) and Carey, II et al. (US 6,858,322 B2). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended, and claim 5 correspondingly amended, to claim that the mounting tails are integrally formed mounting tails on the diecast metal section. In view of original claim 5, this amendment to claim 1 should not require further search or consideration.

Bright et al. in view of Capp et al. clearly does not disclose or suggest integrally formed mounting tails on a diecast metal section as recited in claim 1.

Appl. No.: 10/560,560

Reply to Office Action of: 03/31/2008

Hwang in view of Goodman et al. does not disclose or suggest applicants' invention as claimed in claim 1. The examiner stated that it would be obvious to replace the metal section 90 of Hwang with the diecast metal section 32 of Goodman et al. However, replacing the metal section 90 of Hwang with the diecast metal section 32 of Goodman et al. would eliminate the grounding fingers 912, 932, 952 and spring tab 954. This is contrary to the teachings of Hwang which teaches that the grounding fingers 912, 932, 952 and spring tab 954 are necessary. The grounding fingers 912, 932, 952 are necessary to resiliently engage the panel 200 inside the opening 202 (see Fig. 9) and provide grounding paths to prevent EMI (see Column 5, lines 20-24 and 44-50). The spring tab 954 is necessary to resiliently abut against inner face 203 of the panel 200 as an EMI shield and provide space for the spring latch 52 (see Fig. 9 and column 5, lines 24-35). Replacing the metal section 90 of Hwang with the diecast metal section 32 of Goodman et al. (as the examiner has stated is obvious) would result in there being no resilient grounding fingers 912, 932, 952 and spring tab 954. This would be contrary to the teaching of Hwang. The examiner's combination teaches away from what Hwang teaches. With the examiner's replacement of metal section 90 by diecast metal section 32, there would be no space for spring latch 52 in Hwang. With the examiner's combination of metal section 90 by diecast metal section 32 there would not be the EMI shielding providing by grounding fingers 912, 932, 952 and spring tab 954. Thus, it is not obvious to combine the two references as the examiner is attempting to do.

Appl. No.: 10/560,560
Reply to Office Action of: 03/31/2008

Yamaguchi et al. in view of Goodman et al. also does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1. Yamaguchi et al. discloses that the metal shell 20 is formed from a metal blank (as seen in Fig. 10) into the metal shell so that it may be fixed readily and firmly to the connector housing 10 (see column 7, lines 33-34). The metal shell 20 is deformed on the connector housing 10 such that the engagement pieces 27 are received in the openings 29 (see column 7, lines 35-40 in Yamaguchi et al.) and capture the connector housing 10 between the front panel portion 22 and the fixing pieces 28. If the metal shell 20 of Yamaguchi et al. was replaced by the die cast member 32 of Goodman et al. (as the examiner has stated was obvious) without engagement pieces 27 and fixing pieces 28 to be bent to attach the metal shell to the connector housing 10, this would destroy the ability of a diecast metal housing 32 of Goodman et al. to properly attach to the connector housing 10 of Yamaguchi et al. The examiner's suggested combination of references teaches away from the teaching in Yamaguchi et al. for attaching the member 20 to the connector housing 10. With the examiner's replacement of metal shell 20 by diecast member 32 of Goodman et al., how could diecast member 32 be attached to the connector housing 10 of Yamaguchi et al. without being bent and folded around the housing 10 and locked with 27/29?

The examiner is also directed to column 2, lines 58-65 of Yamaguchi et al. which teaches away from use of a die cast shield. Note the exact language:

"It is also possible to form the shields of the connectors by way of die-casting, instead of the drawn

Appl. No.: 10/560,560

Reply to Office Action of: 03/31/2008

members shown. However, the ductility of such die-cast parts is poor as compared to sheet metal and in these size and style connectors, a high precision for engagement desired. In the reduced size, excessive stresses may develop during insertion and removal of the connectors, so that a fear of deforming the drawn or die-cast shield engagement members is real."

Thus, Yamaguchi explicitly teaches away from using a die cast member in the connector. Thus, it is not obvious to combine the two references as the examiner is attempting to do.

Though the claims dependent upon claim 1 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 1. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Appl. No.: 10/560,560
Reply to Office Action of: 03/31/2008

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington 6/4/08
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686) Date
Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, PC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

6-4-08
Date

Ann Okrentowich
Name of Person Making Deposit